REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 are in the case. The applicants have studied the office action dated June 11, 2007 and believe the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claim. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the recited host is, like the recited sending agent, "of the source." Claim 21 has been amended in a similar fashion. It is believed that such relationship between the recited host and sending agent was implicit in the original claim if not explicit. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 1 and 21 are made to clarify recited features and do not narrow the scope of the claimed inventions.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-30 on the basis of the Applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of US Pat. No. 6,269,431, hereinafter Dunham. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, for example, is directed to a "method for sending data from a source to a destination, comprising: a host of the source providing to a sending agent of the source, virtual memory addresses of data to be sent to a destination wherein the data is stored in a plurality of physical locations of the source, each location having a physical address and a virtual memory address which is mapped to the physical address; the sending agent providing to the host at least some of the virtual memory addresses of the data to be sent to the destination; the host identifying to the sending agent the data addressed by the virtual memory addresses provided by the sending agent; and the sending agent sending the identified data to the destination." The Examiner concedes that the AAPA is "silent on sending agent providing to the host virtual memory addresses of the data to be sent to the destination." However, it is the Examiner's position that "Dunham discloses, sending agent providing to the host at least some of the virtual memory addresses of the data to be sent to the destination (Dunham, Co1.2, lines 32-38, where controller which could be sending agent upon request assigns the virtual storage address/virtual memory address and provide it to host processor)."

As set forth above, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the recited host is, like the recited sending agent, "of the source." Thus, even if the Examiner's position with respect to the Dunham reference were correct, a position not conceded by the applicants, it is clear that in the

Examiner's characterization of the Dunham reference above, the sending agent/storage controller of the Dunham reference is the source of the data, whereas the cited host processor of the Dunham reference is the destination of the data.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for sending data from a source to a destination, in which in one embodiment, a host of the source provides to a sending agent of the source, virtual memory addresses of data to be sent to a destination. The sending agent then provides to the host at least some of the virtual memory addresses of the data to be sent to the destination. In response, the host identifies to the sending agent the data addressed by the virtual memory addresses provided by the sending agent; and the sending agent then sends the identified data to the destination. As set forth in greater detail in the specification, such an arrangement can significantly reduce the amount of source physical memory which is pinned for data transmission by the source as compared to that of the AAPA. It is appreciated that other features may be obtained, depending upon the particular application.

Thus claim 1 is directed to a virtual memory addressing scheme internal to the source. By comparison, the Dunham reference appears to be directed to a system in which the storage controller provides to a host needing backup storage space, a block of virtual addresses for storage. It appears that the host may then address that allocated storage space using the virtual addresses for read or write operations to the backup storage space controlled by the storage controller.

It is clear from the above that the Examiner has cited no portion of either the AAPA or the Dunham reference considered alone or in combination, which in any manner teach or suggest operations of "a host of the source providing to a sending agent of the source, virtual memory addresses of data to be sent to a destination", nor "the sending agent providing to the host at least some of the virtual memory addresses of the data to be sent to the destination" nor "the host identifying to the sending agent the data addressed by the virtual memory addresses provided by the sending agent" as required by claim 1.

Independent claims 11 and 21 may be distinguished in a similar fashion. With respect to claim 21, a "system adapted to communicate with a destination" is recited in which the system comprises, *inter alia*, a host and a sending agent having the recited internal virtual memory addressing scheme.

The remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from the independent claims. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims is improper for the reasons given above. Moreover, the dependent claims include additional limitations, which in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejections of the claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0585.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: September 11, 2007

By: /William Konrad/

William K. Konrad
Registration No. 28,868

Please direct all correspondences to:

William K. Konrad
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7970
Fax: 310-556-7984